UNITED NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/54/502
S/1999/1097
27 October 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-fourth session
Agenda items 63 and 90
QUESTION OF CYPRUS
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE WHOLE
QUESTION OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS
IN ALL THEIR ASPECTS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-fourth year

Letter dated 26 October 1999 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 26 October 1999, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 63 and 90, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volkan VURAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

99-31873 (E) 031199

/...

Annex

Letter dated 26 October 1999 from Mr. Aytuğ Plümer addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot representative at the meeting of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) held on 20 October 1999 under agenda item 90 (Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects). The statement in question contains allegations that distort the realities of Cyprus. Since I am denied the right to speak in the said Committee owing to the usurpation by the Greek Cypriot side of the title of the "Government of Cyprus", I am compelled to set the record straight in writing.

The Greek Cypriot representative claims that the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was established in 1964 following a "recourse in the Security Council by Cyprus against Turkey", giving the wrong impression that it was Turkey, rather than the Greek Cypriot administration itself, which initiated the Cyprus problem in December 1963. The truth is that UNFICYP was established and dispatched to the island under Security Council resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, in order to prevent the wholesale indiscriminate killing of Turkish Cypriots throughout the island by heavily armed Greek Cypriot elements. Hundreds of defenceless Turkish Cypriots fell victim to Greek Cypriot atrocities and one fourth of the total population were driven out of their homes and villages which were razed to the ground.

The Greek Cypriot representative refers to the "1974 invasion and the forcible division" and "the continued military occupation" of the island. There is no mention that on 15 July 1974 Greece and its collaborators on the island staged a bloody coup d'état in Cyprus aimed at forcibly annexing Cyprus to Greece. In the face of the imminent danger posed against the Turkish Cypriot people, Turkey had no alternative but to exercise its rights and obligations set out by the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, and intervened on 20 July 1974. This action was a legitimate intervention that averted the colonization of the island by Greece and prevented the massacre of Turkish Cypriots. Turkey's military presence on the island is an indispensable and effective guard against the Greek-Greek Cypriot aggressive designs given the bitter experiences of the period 1963-1974.

I would like to emphasize that it was the Greek Cypriot armed onslaught in December 1963 against the Turkish Cypriots and the binational order that led to the division of the island when the Turkish Cypriots were forced to live in enclaves, deprived of all basic necessities and fundamental human rights, for 11 years prior to the legal Turkish intervention of 1974.

If the solution of the Cyprus issue has eluded us for many decades, the reasons should be sought at the root of the problem. The lesson to be drawn from the Cyprus peacekeeping effort is that peacemaking is not possible when one of the parties to the dispute usurps the seat of government and uses it as a means of persecuting its former partner. As long as such illegal actions are condoned by the international community the usurper regime will attempt to

consolidate its illegal status rather than respecting the sovereign equality and even the existence of the very side it had sought to eliminate in the first place. So far, peacemaking efforts in Cyprus have not yielded any results precisely because the two sides in Cyprus have not been treated equally and fairly, thus enabling one of the sides to carry out unilateral actions effectively destroying all the parameters of a solution which had emerged over the years within the framework of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.

The repeated allegations made by the Greek Cypriot side demonstrate that it is not prepared to acknowledge the existence of two separate States which will constitute the framework of a new partnership based on the sovereign equality of the two sides in Cyprus. Those parties interested in a peaceful resolution must accord equal treatment to the two States in Cyprus, if ever the Greek Cypriot side is to have any incentive to seek a realistic settlement.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 63 and 90, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ PLÜMER
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus